

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

10/729,097

Application. Filed:

December 08, 2003

Applicant:

Kia Silverbrook, Paul Lapstun and Simon Robert Walmsley

Application Title:

Camera for Printing Manipulated Images on Media

Examiner/GAU:

Jason T WHIPKEY

2612

Dated

June 28, 2005

At:

Balmain, NSW

Docket No.

BAL72US

AMENDMENT C

Commissioner for Patents Washington, District of Columbia 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action of September 21, 2005, please amend the aboveidentified application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 2 of this paper. The Applicant submits that these amendments introduce no new matter.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 6 of this paper.

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION 10/729,097

November 25, 2005 Examiner Jason Whipkey

Voice: 1-571-272-7321 Fax: 1-571-273-7321

In response to the after-final amendment filed November 4, 2005, please note the following problems. If corrections are submitted to the fax number above (<u>not</u> the official fax number given in the Office action), the corrections can be incorporated into an examiner's amendment, thus expediting the potential allowance of the case.

- Regarding claim 3, there is no antecedent basis for "the predetermined information".
- Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because it omits essential elements. Specifically, claim 4 does not describe how "a predetermined information" relates to the camera recited in claim 1.
- For clarity, claim 5 should be modified to replace "comprising a guillotine the processing system" with -- comprising a guillotine, the processing system --.
- For clarity, claim 6 should be modified to replace "the print roll sensor adapted to detect" with -- the print roll sensor, adapted to detect --.
- Regarding claim 8, there is no antecedent basis for "the print roll sensor" or "the print roll drive system".
- For clarity, claim 25 should be modified to replace "a guillotine the method comprising" with -- a guillotine, the method comprising --.
- Regarding claim 27, there is no antecedent basis for "the card" on line 2.